DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 104 SP 023 811

AUTHOR Barnes, Susan
TITLE Student Teachers' Planning and Decision-Making Related to Pupil Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9044
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Cooperating Teachers; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Knowledge Level; Parent Teacher Conferences; Preservice Teacher Education; Reinforcement; *Student Evaluation; Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors
IDENTIFIERS Student Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Findings of the Clinical Teacher Education-Preservice Study were examined to determine the extent to which student teachers possessed planning and decision-making skills related to pupil evaluation. The study focused on findings from cooperating teacher-student teacher conferences and journal data regarding planning and evaluation practices of 20 cooperating teachers, 20 student teachers, and 3 university supervisors. Findings revealed that, while teachers appeared to provide classroom pupils with a great deal of ongoing, informal evaluation, little attention was given to informed, conceptually rigorous evaluation. Student teachers gave little evidence of knowledge about evaluating pupils. Generally favorable evaluations of student teachers were evident from both cooperating teachers and university supervisors; there appeared to be little informed negative feedback. Conclusions drawn include: (1) Building a knowledge base of evaluation is needed in teacher education programs; (2) Guidelines for skill levels of pupils at different stages should be shared with preservice teachers; (3) More opportunities to practice planning, execution, and evaluation should be provided; (4) More attention should be given to preparing student teachers for interactions with parents; and (5) Training for cooperating teachers in conferencing with student teachers is needed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240104

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

STUDENT TEACHERS' PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING RELATED TO PUPIL EVALUATION

Susan Barnes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Report No. 9044

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

February 1983

SP023811

Student Teachers' Planning and Decision-Making Related to Pupil Evaluation

The purpose of this paper is to examine the planning and decision-making skills related to pupil evaluation evidenced by participants in a recent study of student teaching. It is generally accepted that pupil evaluation is primarily the responsibility of the classroom teacher, one which may have consequences reaching far beyond the classroom. Unless one assumes that teachers are born with professional-level evaluation skills, one could reasonably expect the teacher preparation programs to include some attention to this area in teacher training. Since student teaching is usually the culmination of the training program, it is the logical setting where student teachers would be expected to demonstrate the various teaching skills, including evaluation skills. For this paper, the author examined data gathered in a descriptive study of student teaching for evidence of such attention to evaluation skills. Specifically, the questions asked were "What attitudes toward and knowledge of evaluation were exhibited by cooperating teachers and student teachers?" and "What opportunities to practice were given student teachers in the classroom setting?" As public opinion focuses upon teacher performance and accountability, institutions of teacher preparation have a responsibility to their graduates to prepare them at some minimum level for all teaching skills, including professional evaluation of both pupils and their own teaching. Attention will turn toward reporting the findings of the Clinical Teacher Education-Preservice Study conducted by the Research in Teacher Education program at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

From a sample of 200 cooperating teachers (CTs), university supervisors (USs) and student teachers (STs), a smaller sample of 9 university

supervisors, 20 cooperating teachers and 20 student teachers were drawn for more intense study. Participants in the study were located at two teacher education institutions in urban areas with large and various ethnic populations. One was a large public university in a southwestern state, the other was a large private institution in a western state. Both have commendable reputations in teacher preparation.

Few major differences between the two sites were noted. At one site student teachers were required to have two semesters of clinical experience; at the other site, one semester was required. At the second site a small group of cooperating teachers had secured Masters' degrees in supervision of student teachers. As a consequence, a particular supervisory style was exhibited to varying degrees by these cooperating teachers. The core of what might be called the Problem Solving Model (PSM) was exactly that, introducing the student teacher to a particular problem solving process which the student teacher practiced throughout student teaching. The student teacher was taught to identify his/her own concerns as a beginning teacher; for example, the student teacher might be concerned with classroom discipline. After the student teacher identified the concern, the cooperating teacher gathered observation data focused on student misbehavior; the student teacher examined the data, selected a strategy to address the misbehaviors, and implemented the strategy; the cooperating teacher again observed the effects of the new strategy. The cycle repeated itself, moving only to a new topic as the student teacher identified the topic as a new concern. As will be noted later the PSM cooperating teachers were qualitatively different from other cooperating teachers in the study in their work with student teachers.

A variety of data was gathered from the participants including journal entries, audiotaped conferences and interviews, and classroom observations, as well as results from repeated administration of a battery of nine quantitative instruments measuring cognitive, philosophical and psychological attributes of the participants. This paper draws most heavily upon interviews, conferences and journals. For a more detailed description of the study, especially the analysis of the qualitative data, consult Griffin, Barnes, Hughes, O'Neal, Defino, Edwards, and Hukill (Note 1).

Attention will first be given to the findings from the conference and journal data regarding the more general planning and evaluation practices of the cooperating teachers and student teachers. Next, findings from interview data relating the planning and execution of plans for evaluation will be discussed. From these findings, conclusions and implications for preservice education will be suggested.

Findings from Conference and Journal Data

Conference Data

Student teacher/cooperating teacher conferences were usually held for feedback or planning purposes. Characteristics of the conferences were analyzed by examining the (a) level of participation, (b) process, and (c) content. Cooperating teachers contributed 72% of the input during conferences while student teachers contributed 18%. This picture is one of verbal domination of the planning conference by the cooperating teacher. Comments most frequently made by both cooperating teachers and student teachers were those which reviewed or commented on classroom events or student teaching events. The next most frequently occurring comments by the cooperating teacher were classified as direction-giving to the student teacher; the student teacher responded by simply acknowledging the various comments made by

the cooperating teacher. Evaluative comments made by the cooperating teacher (8.29%) or the student teacher (4.35%) were relatively infrequent and most of these were positive. These comments dealt with evaluation of classroom pupils or the student teacher in equal portions. Little evidence was found in conferences that cooperating teachers and student teachers spent time discussing and planning for the evaluation of classroom pupils.

Journal Data

Although journals were analyzed into five categories, only one, "teaching," contained data related to planning and evaluation. Within this category cooperating teachers and university supervisors most frequently made general, positive, evaluative comments (f = 203) about the performance of the student teachers, followed in frequency by general, negative evaluative (f = 101) statements. Positive comments focused to a large degree on teaching skills while negative comments of cooperating teachers focused most frequently on the student teachers' (1) lack of experience and educational background in subject matter, (2) lack of creativity and initiative, (3)lack of preparation and organization, (4) poor lesson delivery, and (5) lack of evaluation skills.

Next in frequency were positive self evaluative comments by the student teachers (f = 28) and statements about the assessment of pupils (f = 23), usually for the purpose of planning instruction to meet individual needs. Student teachers recorded a total of 29 comments about the evaluation of classroom pupils which was more frequent than cooperating teachers (f = 13). Plainly, planning and conducting evaluation for classroom pupils did not occupy much attention from cooperating teachers or student teachers in the more reflective mode of data collection, journal entries. If evaluation received little attention in planning conferences and in the journals, perhaps direct elicitation was necessary to find out how teachers in the study

addressed planning for evaluation. An examination of interview data should be enlightening.

Interview Data

More extensive information was found in the interviews; some organization of the findings is helpful. Within this section, findings have been grouped according to the participants' personal opinions about evaluation, their knowledge of evaluation concepts, their perceived purposes for evaluation, and the processes used and the criteria employed in evaluation.

Before addressing the interview findings, a word is needed to describe the perspectives of participants reported here. To begin with, evaluation during the student teaching experience is multilayered--the student teacher and cooperating teacher are evaluating classroom pupils while the cooperating teacher and university supervisor are evaluating the student teacher. Under discussion here is pupil evaluation about two kinds of pupils--classroom students and university students. Evaluation of the student teacher is included for two reasons: (1) the student teacher is legitimately a pupil, a student in a professional preparation sequence, and our investigation of the evaluation process as applied to the student teacher may be used to guide novice cooperating teachers in their practice of supervision and evaluation; and, (2) since the cooperating and university supervisor can be viewed as modeling an evaluation process for the student teacher, an investigation of the quality of that process can be informative.

Personal Opinion

In the interview participants were asked their personal opinions of grading and evaluating classroom pupils. The majority of participants in all three groups (university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher) said that grading and evaluation was the most difficult aspect of teaching.

This was a pervasive, negative, and surprising finding. The majority of cooperating teachers particularly voiced fears about both long and short term effects of negative evaluations on student behavior, attitude, and achievement. Several cooperating teachers and student teachers recalled their own negative experiences as the subjects of evaluation during their own schooling. It is interesting to note, however, that neither cooperating teachers nor university supervisors voiced corresponding fears about the evaluation of student teachers. As will be remembered from the conference data, few negative comments were actually communicated to student teachers.

Knowledge of Evaluation Concepts

The results of examining student teachers' knowledge of evaluation concepts was quite disappointing. One-fourth of the student teachers indicated in some manner during the interview that they did not know what was meant by the term "evaluation." Others equated evaluation with no more than "grading" or marking papers. More than one-half of all participants said that student teachers were not sufficiently prepared to begin student teaching in the areas of diagnosing learner needs or evaluating pupils. One exception was noted; cooperating teachers said the student teachers who had taken methods courses in certain subject areas (reading was mentioned specifically) showed more skill at diagnosing needs and evaluating in those particular areas. In other words, definite learning was attributed to university coursework. While this appraisal is a pleasing one for university based teacher educators, cooperating teachers expressed another widely held, and seemingly contradictory, opinion. While university coursework was seen as useful, cooperating teachers said that the deficiencies of student teachers could be best remedied by more and diverse experience in the classroom. In effect, cooperating teachers concluded that most student teachers came to the

classroom acceptably prepared to begin student teaching, with enough basic information so that they could benefit best simply by getting in there and learning about kids.

Cooperating teachers exhibited a mechanical conception of evaluation as related to classroom students. That knowledge focused upon the mechanics of the grading system extant in the district, i.e., giving E, S, U versus A, B, C or 95, 72 or 80. Evidence that cooperating teachers used a conceptual framework for evaluation beyond intuitive judgments, loosely based upon numerous daily grades, was not apparent. No guiding road map for evaluating pupil progress was apparent.

Looking at the knowledge base used by cooperating teachers for evaluating student teachers, a disturbing phenomena was noted. Most cooperating teachers in the sample operated again at a mechanical level; in other words, they seemed most concerned about meeting university requirements. The university supervisors usually provided "pacing guides" which formed the core of the student teaching experience. Most cooperating teachers made their student teacher responsible for accomplishing the tasks set out in the pacing guide while others ignored even the mechanical workings of the system, or were unaware of the requirements. Few cooperating teachers reported using the forms requested by the university at one site. It seems entirely possible from their interviews that the underlying principles encouraged by the system were either unknown to the cooperating teachers or rejected by them or their student teachers.

The behaviors of four cooperating teachers who had received masters degrees in the supervision of student teachers implied a knowledge of evaluation. An important component of their problem-solving process was self evaluation by the student teacher, and the ultimate goal of that program was

to produce classroom teachers who were able to identify concerns, gather appropriate data, generate and choose alternatives, and evaluate the effects of the alternative chosen. The fact that these cooperating teachers led the student teacher through the process implies knowledge of an evaluation process. This subgroup supplied the only consistent evidence of knowledge of this type by the sample.

The picture of the university supervisor that emerges is more pleasing. Through the common practice of sharing final evaluation criteria with the student teachers early in the experience, continual referral to those criteria (often biweekly), and the use of those criteria at the culmination of the semester, university supervisors also implied knowledge of basic evaluation concepts.

Perceived Purposes of Evaluation

Cooperating teachers and student teachers viewed evaluation of classroom pupils quite differently, perhaps because of their different degrees of experience. For cooperating teachers' evaluation, and we're speaking of basically "grading" here, had one main purpose, to provide a source of information for parents and students. Student teachers, on the other hand, had a different view of evaluation. Four major functions were seen for evaluation: (1) as a technique for motivating students; (2) as a communication link to parents; (3) as a way to order and classify students; and, (4) as a method to measure their own effectiveness.

When the student teacher became the focus of evaluation, most cooperating teachers and university supervisors defined evaluation by the final evaluation forms. As a consequence the purpose of evaluation was to make judgments about the levels of competencies achieved by the student teachers in certain skill areas and about the display, or failure to display, certain personal

qualities. Cooperating teachers did not address the gatekeeping function of evaluation; university supervisors did so rarely.

Process of Evaluation

Cooperating teachers performed ongoing, informal evaluations of pupil progress using observations and oral interactions with pupils to gather their information. The comments to students, written or oral, were usually positive. Most cooperating teachers advocated positive reinforcement; one cooperating teacher said she only "marked things right." Cooperating teachers stated that, based upon these informal evaluations, they knew "where the students were" better than if they had used paper and pencil tests. When determining the "grades" to be entered on report cards and communicated to parents, most cooperating teachers went beyond purely averaging numbers to make more global judgments of progress.

Most cooperating teachers valued highly the parent conference as a means of communication. Although conferences were time consuming, cooperating teachers saw them as avenues through which the report cards could be interpreted both literally and figuratively. Depending upon locations and grade level, parents encountered E's, U's, and S's, A's, B's, C's, D's, and F's, or number grades. Some report cards contained 32 sections with grades given within each section. For certain parents, particularly new immigrants to the system, some teacher explanation of the system would be necessary if the reports were to achieve their desired purpose, communication of student progress. Through the parent conferences, held at least annually, teachers hoped some cooperative effort could be launched to address the areas where students were not performing well and to secure the cooperation of parents to reinforce these areas at home.

Student teachers employed the same informal, continuous evaluation process as did the cooperating teachers, however, they were less sure of where the students were in terms of progress toward some goal. This is not surprising since cooperating teachers seemed to depend upon some undefined criteria developed through experience when determining "where students were." Student teachers did not see parent conferences as an element of the evaluation process nor did they ascribe to the parent conferences the same value as did the cooperating teachers. Some student teachers expressed fear of conducting or even attending parent conferences. One has the impression that the realization that they would have contact with parents and might need to know how to conduct parent conferences was a new one.

The process used to evaluate the student teacher was quite similar to the process of evaluating classroom pupils. Both cooperating teachers and university supervisors used an informal, continuous evaluation process with student teachers. Most cooperating teachers offered daily or even hourly general evaluative comments to student teachers, while university supervisors communicated usually on a weekly basis. This feedback was overwhelmingly positive in nature. A similarity between the feedback given by cooperating teachers to both student teachers and classroom pupils is evident--frequent, positive reinforcement.

The content of the evaluative comments differed somewhat in focus for cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Cooperating teachers focused most often on behavior management followed by the student teachers' command of the content. Next they placed equal emphasis upon classroom planning and organization and rapport with students. University supervisors also focused most often upon behavior management and classroom organization but then focused upon instructional skills and evidence of learning from the classroom

pupils. Student teachers then could easily receive quite different feedback on a lesson depending upon who was observing.

When making final evaluations, both cooperating teachers and university supervisors went beyond merely averaging the ratings assigned to the various criteria. Both judged the prospects of the various student teachers to become valuable members of the profession and "excellent teachers" based on some undefined idiosyncratic process inherent to the evaluator. Having examined the processes used to evaluate pupils, let us turn our attention to the criteria employed in that evaluation.

Criteria Used

When evaluating classroom students, neither cooperating teachers nor student teachers articulated clear, objective criteria. Instead a pervasive and unresolved conflict was evident between evaluation on the basis of performance and evaluation on the basis of effort. Evidence that the conflict infused all levels of one setting is provided by the adoption at one site of a new report form which informs parents of both achievement level and effort. The student is reported by grade level (1st grade level in a 3rd grade class) as well as by degree of industriousness. Despite the new form, making decisions about pupil evaluations still were based upon fairly nebulous opinions about "how Johnny or Jenny is doing" with no real goal articulated for Johnny or Jenny. Very little evidence was found of cooperating teachers using any commonly understood planning processes, which usually include an evaluation component and which are usually introduced in preservice educational programs. Since cooperating teachers were in the midst of this dilemma, it should not be surprising to find student teachers making the same omissions.

Cooperating teachers and university supervisors differed in the criteria used in the formative evaluation of the student teachers. Cooperating teachers focused on lesson delivery, student behavior, command of content, and interactions with students while university supervisors focused most often on student behavior, classroom organization, lesson delivery, interactions with students, and student progress. It follows that for most student teachers the feedback which they received was in the areas noted.

The situation for the PSM cooperating teachers was somewhat different as might be expected from the particular problem-solving process they were using. Their focus was usually whatever concerned the student teacher--student behavior, rate of positive versus negative reinforcement, questioning strategies, and so on. Feedback was uniquely tied to the particular cooperating teacher-student teacher dyad.

Looking at criteria used in summative evaluation of the student teachers, a different picture emerges. Both cooperating teachers and university supervisors used the criteria in the final evaluation form to make summative evaluations about student teachers. In no case did one of the participants question the value of measuring performance on any one of these criteria. They did indicate, however, that being a "good teacher" went beyond mere attainment of skills in the areas assessed. Criteria for determining a "good teacher" were undefined.

In most cases, it should be noted, the criteria upon which ongoing informal evaluations were based over the course of the semester did not coincide with the criteria used for the final evaluations, especially with cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers appeared to evaluate on a formative basis from implicit criteria which placed more emphasis on some skills and less on others. The lack of congruence between formative and

summative criteria was especially true for the cooperating teacher who had participated in the PSM program. By practicing the problem solving process associated with the PSM program, student teachers may have had concerns in areas other than those upon which they would be rated on the final evaluation form. As a consequence, their PSM-trained cooperating teachers would have gathered data for student teachers to use in meeting their concerns rather than data keyed to improvement in areas listed on the final evaluation form.

At both sites, student teachers were often encouraged to evaluate their own performance, usually once a day by the cooperating teacher and after every visit by the university supervisor. Cooperating teachers tended to ask student teachers how they "felt" about the lesson. The student teachers' satisfaction with the lesson was the commonly accepted criterion for these self-evaluations. The university supervisors, on the other hand, most often used the final evaluation criterion when asking student teachers to self-evaluate in a more formal manner. University supervisors often asked student teachers to periodically review the final evaluation form and rate themselves on the criteria.

Evaluation of Student Teachers

This section will focus solely on the outcomes related to student teachers since data upon the outcomes regarding classroom pupils was sketchy.

The most striking point about the final ratings of student teachers is the virtual transformation of ugly ducklings into graceful swans, or frogs into princes and princesses. Based on five point scales, average rating at one site was 4.48 (between "frequently" and "consistently"), at the other site 4.42 (between "commendable" and "high degree of excellence"). Given that some in teacher education assume that the gatekeeping function should have operated before student teaching, this restricted range of ratings is still surprising.

While many of the student teachers were excellent, a number were not perceived by our observers to be so excellent as the ratings would indicate.

Despite quite generally favorable final evaluation ratings of the students teachers, during interviews, however, cooperating teachers expressed some concerns with the readiness of their student teachers to assume responsibility for a classroom. Three said that the student teachers associated with them were not ready for their own classroom. Since two of these were first semester student teachers in a two semester program this should not be construed as a problem. Five other student teachers, however, were recommended only for certain grade levels, usually primary grades because of content weaknesses, lack of classroom control, or generally inadequate intellectual development. On final evaluations cooperating teachers often used a phrase like "with additional classroom experience" to indicate weaker students. The combination of negative comments reported in journals and the lack of corresponding negative comments in conferences, pictures cooperating teachers as persons who do not make public negative comments.

Of specific interest to us here is the evaluation of student teachers in the skill area of planning and evaluation. When rating the specific evaluation skills of student teachers, at one site cooperating teachers tended to list the various methods used by student teachers to measure the progress of classroom pupils without making any judgment on the student teachers' skill. At the second site, evaluation skills related to classroom pupils were not assessed on the final evaluation form; however, engagement in self-evaluation was. This omission implies that evaluation skills were of relatively low value.

University supervisors rated student teachers similarly to cooperating teachers: disagreement between university supervisors and cooperating

teachers on ratings were so rare as to be considered nonexistent. University supervisors did venture to say that failure to attain the objectives of student teaching was usually due to character flaws--lack of motivation, personal problems, work overload, etc. rather than lack of training or experience in general or their own or cooperating teacher's supervision. Several university supervisors did say that student teachers could benefit from more exposure to parents, other school settings, and other teachers.

Student teachers on the other hand, saw their own weaknesses in the area of "teaching skills," more specifically the individualization of instruction to meet students' needs, of which evaluation is an integral part.

What conclusions and implications can be drawn from these findings for beginning educators, both new teachers and new cooperating teachers?

Conclusions

While teachers involved in the study appeared to provide classroom students with a wealth of ongoing, informal "evaluation," little attention was given to informed, conceptually rigorous evaluation. One has the impression that most teachers provided evaluative information to parents in the form of report cards only because they were required to do so by district policy. These conclusions corroborate other findings about teachers' attention to evaluation; more specifically, there is little or no attention given to evaluation (Yinger, 1977; Morine, Note 2; Taylor, Note 3; Shavelson, Note 4). These findings lead to the question, "Why is this so, despite the best efforts of teacher educators to convince teachers of the value of a planning process which includes an evaluation component?" Although this question cannot be answered definitively, the data allow informal speculation.

Conclusion 1: These teachers did not approach evaluation with a positive attitude. The driving force of the negative attitude seemed to be

multifaceted: (1) the avoidance of hurting the feelings of the evaluated, (2) a general lack of knowledge beyond the mechanics unique to the contextual setting, and (3) the unresolved conflict of the criteria to be used in evaluating. Given these findings, it should not be surprising that formal evaluation was avoided, if possible.

Conclusion 2: Given the sorry state of knowledge about evaluation that was exhibited and the lack of resolution of the criteria question, most evaluation was highly subjective and variable. Experience may in fact be the best teacher if this is to be the case. Since cooperating teachers usually evaluated classroom students on the basis of how the cooperating teacher felt the student was doing, a rich experiential background with other students becomes very important. On the other hand, if evaluation which is more balanced between subjective and objective criteria is desired, then more training in evaluation skills and more planning and practice is necessary.

Conclusion 3: Parent conferences assumed a good deal of importance in the evaluation process. Student teachers apparently were expected to pick up the skill needed to conduct parent conferences by jumping in to sink or swim. Given the importance attached to these parent conferences by practitioners some more purposeful preparation by the teacher education institution is indicated. Surely we can do better than sink or swim.

Conclusion 4: The ease with which most cooperating teachers adapted to the use of the university provided evaluation criteria for student teachers supports a proposition that clearly defined criteria to be used in evaluating classroom students might be adapted with similar ease. These cooperating teachers evaluated usually on the basis of completion of and performance on particular tasks. Most student teachers, on the other hand, were so naive in their knowledge of curriculum organization that doubt is cast on their ability

to construct minimum skill levels for students associated with the task requirements for particular grade levels and subjects. What implications for practice can be drawn from the conclusions?

Implications

1. Direct attention to building a knowledge base of evaluation is needed in the university preparation program at all levels. This preparation must go beyond mere knowledge to the provision of opportunities to practice classroom evaluation.

2. Guidelines for skill levels of pupils in different subjects and at different grade levels can be designed and shared with teachers in preparation. These could give new teachers something concrete to work with, to adapt, as they begin their new profession.

3. More opportunities to practice planning, execution and evaluation at earlier stages in classroom settings should be provided in the teacher preparation program. Although this in situ preparation is time consuming and costly, it may be the most valuable of components as it adds to the experiential base of the beginning teacher, especially those who will have only one semester of student teaching.

4. More attention should be given to prepare student teachers for interactions with parents. Awareness of and practice in the principles of conducting effective adult conferences is necessary. Here classroom simulation at the university could be a very effective learning experience.

5. Training for cooperating teachers in conferencing with student teachers is also needed. The PSM cooperating teachers had some training in such a process which qualitatively made a difference in their formative evaluations when compared with those given by untrained

cooperating teachers. Perhaps the process could be divorced from the concerns content so that formative and summative evaluations would be congruent in focus.

Summary. This paper has reported an investigation of the planning and decision making skills of a sample of students teachers and cooperating teachers. Findings, conclusions, and implications have been presented. The importance of evaluation skills would probably be acknowledged by most. The mark of the teacher as opposed to the classroom aide of the future may be the ability to diagnose obstacles to student learning, or what went wrong. Any literate person will be able to read the teacher's manual, follow directions and conduct instruction at that level. A teacher who is a skilled evaluator will still be needed to pinpoint skills missing in the student's background or what points were not clearly presented to the students. In the evaluation processes reported here the implied major goals for both classroom pupils and students teachers were (1) task engagement and (2) positive affect. Cognitive progress was not an implied goal. It should be if teachers are to be more than behavior managers or child care attendants in the future.

Reference Notes

1. Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughes, B., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, D., & Hukill, H. Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.
2. Morine, G. A study of teacher planning. BTES Technical Report 75-11-6. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975.
3. Taylor, P. H. How teachers plan their courses. New York: National Foundation for Educational Research, 1970.
4. Shavelson, R. Review of research on teachers' pedagogical judgments, plans, and decisions. Elementary School Journal, 1983, 83, in press.

Reference

Yinger, R. J. A study of teacher planning: Description and theory development using ethnographic and information processing methods. In W. Doyle & T. Good (Eds.) Focus on Teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.